

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action. Favorable reconsideration of the application is requested in view of the remarks made herein.

Claims 1–2 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurosawa (U.S. Patent No. 6,709,543) in view of either Odajima et al. (U.S. Patent Publication 2001/0029088) or Tsujimoto (U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0070517). Traversal of this rejection is made for at least the following reasons. The cited references fail to show a bent range set in a direction which forms a predetermined angle with respect to one side of the semiconductor chip, wherein the bent range includes a corner portion of the semiconductor chip and wherein the predetermined angle is about 45 degrees, as recited in claim 1. Claim 1 further requires that the semiconductor chip adhered to the sheet is bent and deformed only by the vacuum suction force so as to exfoliate the sheet from the semiconductor chip. On the other hand, Kurosawa does not disclose the above-cited configuration. For instance, Kurosawa requires a thrust pin 24a to exfoliate the chip from the sheet. While Odajima may teach the chip rotating at 45 degrees, Odajima does not disclose the bending and deformation of the chip. Accordingly, it is not disclosed that the bent range includes a corner portion of the semiconductor chip recited in claim 1.

For at least the reasons discussed above, the combination of Kurosawa and either Odajima or Tsujimoto does not disclose, teach, or suggest each and every limitation as set forth in claims 1, 2, and 11. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 5–10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Akira (JP 2001-118862) in view of Kurosawa (U.S. Patent No. 6,709,543) and either Odajima et al. (U.S. Patent Publication 2001/0029088) or Tsujimoto (U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0070517). Traversal of this rejection is made for at least the following reasons. As stated above, the combination of Kurosawa and either Odajima or Tsujimoto is improper as Kurosawa is directed to a separation method using thrust pins and a vacuum source; while both Odajima and Tsujimoto use peeling operations. Further, Odajima expressly discourages teaches away from the thrust pin and vacuum methods disclosed in Kurosawa in favor of the peeling methods disclosed in Odajima and Tsujimoto.

Akira does not make up for the deficiencies of Kurosawa. The examiner concedes that Akira fails to show the semiconductor chip to be bent.

For at least these reasons, the combination of Akira, Kurosawa, and either Odajima or Tsujimoto cannot render obvious claims 5-10. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 35857.

Respectfully submitted,
PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By: /Una L. Lauricia/
Una L. Lauricia – Reg. No. 48998

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

Date: May 22, 2008